

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION**

Cathlena Jenkins Bright,)	C/A No. 6:17-1431-CMC-KFM
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
Nancy A. Berryhill,)	OPINION & ORDER
Acting Commissioner of Social Security)	
Administration,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

Through this action, Plaintiff seeks judicial review of the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying Plaintiff's claim for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income benefits under Titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act. The matter is currently before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation ("Report") of Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rules 73.02(B)(2)(a) and 83.VII.02, *et seq.*, D.S.C.

The Report, filed on February 16, 2018, recommends the court deny Plaintiff's motion for default judgment. ECF No. 23 (motion); ECF No. 31 (Report). The Report explains the Commissioner's answer was not due until December 1, 2017, and was filed on that date. ECF No. 31 at 2.¹ No objection to the Report has been filed despite notice of the right to object and passage of the time allowed for doing so.

¹ Plaintiff's motion was filed on November 27, 2017. ECF No. 23.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Given the absence of objection, the court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. Finding none, the court adopts and incorporates the Report by reference. For the reasons set forth therein, Plaintiff’s motion for default judgment is denied and the matter is recommitted to the Magistrate Judge for further proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE
Senior United States District Judge

Columbia, South Carolina
March 14, 2018

